

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant's undersigned attorney thanks Examiner Gold for the brief telephonic interview on October 26, 2004. During the interview, Examiner Gold discussed the application of Gupta in rejecting claim 1. No other material was discussed.

The claims are rejected as either being anticipated by Gupta alone, or as being obvious over Gupta in view of some other reference(s). Applicant has amended the claims to clarify what is considered to be the invention. It is respectfully submitted that, as the claims are amended, the Gupta reference is not applicable.

In particular, Gupta discloses (at the portions cited by the Examiner), a mechanism for "packing" communication between a single HTTP client and a web server. For example, see the Abstract, where it is stated that a proxy layer resides on a mobile client station. The proxy layer on the mobile client station captures HTTP requests and packs the HTTP requests for upstream transmission. At the server, the HTTP request messages are recovered and are then sent to an appropriate web server for further processing. Responsive HTTP messages are packed for transmission to the mobile client station, and the proxy layer on the mobile client station recovers the HTTP responses, which are then sent to the web browser for processing. As a result, Gupta explains, packed messages are sent in a bandwidth efficient manner over the wireless network. See, for example, col. 4, lines 25-40.

Gupta does not disclose HTTP requests are received from a plurality of HTTP client applications, wherein the HTTP request data and associated connection identifiers are sent in a stream from a network cache accelerator of the web server to a file system of the web server. Put another way, Gupta does not disclose that a "stream" corresponds to HTTP requests received from a plurality of HTTP clients. On the other hand, any amalgamation of HTTP requests that could be even potentially be gleaned in the cited portions of Gupta correspond to HTTP requests from a single HTTP client. Gupta does not commingle HTTP requests from different HTTP clients.

Gupta's handling of HTTP response data is, in some sense, symmetrical to that discussed above with respect to the HTTP request data. Similarly, Gupta does not commingle HTTP responses for different HTTP clients. Similar to that discussed above with respect to HTTP requests, Gupta does not disclose a "stream" that corresponds to HTTP responses for HTTP requests received from a plurality of HTTP clients.

Thus, it would not be possible for the Examiner to make a *prima facie* case that any of the independent claims are anticipated by Gupta. Independent claims 1, 28 and 30 each relate, at least in part, to sending HTTP request data and associated connection identifiers, for HTTP requests from a plurality of HTTP clients, in a stream from a network cache accelerator of a web server to a file system of a web server. Independent claims 22, 31 and 33 each relate, at least in part, to sending HTTP response data and obtained associated connection identifiers for a

plurality of HTTP requests from a plurality of HTTP clients, in a stream from a file system of a web server to a network cache accelerator of the web server.

Claims 2-21 depend either directly or indirectly on independent claim 1. It would similarly not be possible for the Examiner to make a prima facie case that any of claims 2-21 are anticipated by Gupta.

Furthermore, it would not be possible for the Examiner to make a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to Gupta, since Gupta does not suggest HTTP requests are received from a plurality of HTTP client applications, wherein the HTTP request data and associated connection identifiers are sent in a stream from a network cache accelerator of the web server to a file system of the web server. Nor does Gupta suggest sending HTTP response data and obtained associated connection identifiers for a plurality of HTTP requests from a plurality of HTTP clients, in a stream from a file system of a web server to a network cache accelerator of the web server.

With specific regard to claims 14, 16 and 17, the Examiner has applied a combination of Gupta and Kawabe. Claims 14, 16 and 17 depend indirectly (through claim 13), on independent claim 1. Kawabe is not cited to make up the deficiencies in Gupta. Rather, Kawabe is cited for an alleged disclosure of using "a file descriptor as a handle for accessing the, private attachment, resource corresponding to a name." Thus, as cited, Kawabe does not make up the deficiencies in a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to any of the presently pending claims, including claims 14, 16 and 17.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Gupta (whether alone or in combination with Kawabe) does not support a prima facie case of anticipation or obviousness of the presently-pending claims. Applicant thus respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant further respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that an additional telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300